

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,083	04/02/2001	Krishnadas C. Kootale	020431.0790	1702
7590 11/07/2003			EXAMINER	
Christopher W. Kennerly			HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G	
Baker Botts L.I Suite 600	P.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2001 Ross Avenue			2172	
Dallas, TX 75	5201 -		DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·	Application N .	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/825,083	KOOTALE, KRISHNADAS C.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Monplaisir G Hamilton	2172			
The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspond nce address			
THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: 4,5,13,14,22,23,30,32 and 34.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,6-12,15-21,24-29,31 and 33</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer					
10. Other:		·			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner holds that the disclosure of Huang and Lobley renders the claimed invention unpatentable. Applicant has argued that Huang fails to disclose "an allocation based on current demand values of the children and the variations of the children" Examiner disagrees with applicant Huang discloses the use statistical forecasts for products and customers wherein the data is based on POS data-current data. The forecast uses both top-down and bottom-up analysis, which uses a tree data structure having parent child relationships. Examiner holds that Huang discloses the claimed allocation based on current values and variation of the children.

KIM VU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100